

**REMARKS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The drawings have been objected to for not showing all of the features of claim 1. Specifically, the drawings were objected to for not showing the feature of the movable body moving at least one of a probe, recited in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to remove this language and, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's grounds for objecting to the drawings have been removed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objections is hereby requested.

Claim 8 has been rejected based upon 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. While the undersigned disagrees with the Examiner's grounds for rejection (it being noted that the cited decision is related to a claim in which broad language and 'narrower' language are provided in the same claim), it is respectfully submitted that the amendment to claim 1 removes the Examiner's stated grounds for rejecting claim 8. Further, claim 8 has been amended to further define the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. As a result of these factors, it is believed that claim 8 clearly and particularly defines the invention as required by 35 USC 112, second paragraph and, accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is hereby requested.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected as being unpatentable over US 5,867,916 to Matzkovits in view of US 6,427,355 to Tano. For the following reasons, the

Examiner's grounds for rejection are traversed.

The present invention is directed to a measuring machine including a base that slidably supports a movable body. A guide rail is provided on the base and has a guide surface on which the movable body is slidably supported. The movable body is adapted to slide via an air bearing device on the guide surface of the guide rail. The guide rail is monolithically formed with the base, and a coating film for rust prevention is formed on the guide surface. In this regard it is noted that the present invention provides a guide surface that slidably supports a movable body using an air bearing provided by an integral guide rail, which is coated with a rust-proof coating. The inventive structure facilitates movement of the movable body, and long term use of the measuring machine. Thus, the present invention improves upon the conventional separate (stainless) component, as noted in the background section of the present application.

The cited Matzkovits reference teaches a stand that is slidable along a groove formed in a base. However, the stand is not supported by an air bearing, as suggested by the Examiner. Rather, Matzkovits teaches a pneumatic cylinder that is used as an elevation mechanism of the measurement arm. The pneumatic cylinder does not support the stand relative to the base, cannot be interpreted as being an air bearing, and has nothing to do with a support mechanism employing an air bearing. Thus, it will be appreciated that the pneumatic cylinder is neither an air bearing, nor is it related to supporting the stand for sliding movement over or along the groove in the base.

Since no air bearing is used, disclosed, or suggested in Matzkovits, it is respectfully submitted that Matzkovits cannot be cited as teaching "the movable

body adapted to slide via an air bearing device on the guide surface of the guide rail, the movable body being moved to measure a workpiece, wherein said guide rail is monolithically formed with said base, and a coating film for rust prevention is formed on said guide surface", as required by claim 1.

Tano is cited as teaching a coating film formed on a surface of a gauge block. However, it is considered clear that Tano also fails to teach or suggest an air bearing on the guide surface of the guide rail. Thus, without regard to the lack of motivation to combine the references in the manner proposed by the Examiner, even if Matzkovits were combined with Tano, insofar as neither of the references teaches or suggests the required air bearing, the combination of Matzkovits and Tano cannot be interpreted as teaching this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the rejection based upon the proposed combination of references should be withdrawn.

Further, since no other rejections on the art of record have been set forth in the Office action, and since all of the formal grounds for rejection have been removed or overcome by the present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. KIN-15462.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David E. Spaw, Reg. No. 34732

4080 Erie Street  
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836  
(216) 566-9700